



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/728,905

12/08/2003

Shigeo Nanno

032080

9322

38834

7590

06/02/2006

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP  
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

CRENSHAW, MARVIN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/728,905

Applicant(s)

NANNO, SHIGEO

Examiner

Marvin P. Crenshaw

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5 - 8, 10, 11 14 - 16 and 19 - 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 - 4, 9 12, 13, 17 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/08/2003
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION*****Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 5 – 8, 10, 11, 14 – 16 and 19 – 25 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of copending Application No. 10/728,885. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because everything claimed in claims 1, 5 – 8, 10, 11, 14 – 16 and 19 – 25 are also claimed in claim 7 of application 10/728,885.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1, 5 – 8, 10, 11, 14 – 16 and 19 – 25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the double patenting rejection(s), set forth in this Office action.

Claims 2 – 4, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With respect to claim 1, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including a duplex image forming device comprising a reversible transportation unit which is inserted to a side the image forming device to cover an upper part of the storage opening and includes a reversible transportation path that is formed to pass through the storage opening for transporting out to an upstream side of the printing unit, the paper transported from a downstream side of the printing unit in the paper transportation path.

With respect to claim 2, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including the duplex image forming device wherein the reversible transportation unit further includes a plurality of means for transporting that are disposed along the reversible transportation path, and a part of at least one of the means for transporting is disposed the storage opening.

With respect to claim 4, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including the duplex image forming device wherein the paper transportation path is formed from the paper feed unit upward in a vertical direction and connected to the discharge tray.

With respect to claim 9, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including the duplex image forming device wherein the cover member is provided on the reversible transportation unit.

With respect to claim 12, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including the duplex image forming device wherein a storage unit which stores the manual paper feed tray is formed on the main body frame of the reversible transportation unit.

With respect to claim 16, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including a reversible transportation unit inserted into an image forming device, comprising a reversible transportation path which transports out an upstream side of a printing unit, a paper transported from a downstream side of the printing unit in a paper transportation path of the image forming device wherein the reversible transportation path is formed to pass through a storage opening which stores a manual paper feed tray attached to the image forming device.

With respect to claim 17, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including the reversible transportation unit further comprising a plurality of means for transporting that are disposed along the reversible transportation path, and a part of at least one of the means for transporting is disposed in the storage opening.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

Art Unit: 2854

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marvin P. Crenshaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-2158. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MPC  
May 25, 2006



Daniel J. Colilla  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2854